

Manuscript: “**Evaluation of the Opportunities for Prevention of the Periodontal Diseases Among the Pregnant Women in Tbilisi**”

Submitted: 12 April 2021

Accepted: 12 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Veriko Tevzadze

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elza Nikoleishvili, The University of Georgia. Georgia

Reviewer 2: José Grillo Evangelista, Égas Moniz, CRL, Portugal

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Elza Nikoleishvili	
University/Country: The University of Georgia. Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.04.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.04.2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of the Opportunities for Prevention of the Periodontal Diseases Among the Pregnant Women in Tbilisi	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Evaluation of the Opportunities- means to evaluate risk factors depend on this study. Of course the researcher can choose the title, but would be better to use epidemiology terms. Especially when the risk factors are shown in the research results.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Only few grammatical errors (3-4 words)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Study method is observational. It will be better to describe (mention) study method in the abstract)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Results are clear)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think analyzing these small notes will help the author to make the article more complete.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: José Grillo Evangelista	
University/Country: Égas Moniz, CRL/ Portugal	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/4/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/4/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of the Opportunities for Prevention of the Periodontal Diseases Among the Pregnant Women in Tbilisi.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0475/21.	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Is correct	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Is correct	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	2

mistakes in this article.	
<p>Abstract</p> <p>Results-Line 2- 50,5% of the respondents is the - gets better- 50,5% of the respondents are</p> <p>Line 3- bachelors' student or has – gets better- bachelors' students or have</p> <p>Line 4 - status, 47.7% of them are (the)- remove the</p> <p>Line 5 - satisfactory; 32,9% of the respondents have (a) dental- remove a</p> <p>Line 7- pain or discomfort, 67.3% of them have (a) bleeding gums – remove a</p> <p>Line 10 - The awareness of the pregnant women about the safety of dental manipulations is also quite low – suggestion- Pregnant women´s awareness about the safety of dental manipulation is also quite low,</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>Line 7 - A half of the respondents participating in the survey (is the) bachelors' student or (has) - gets better- A half of the respondents participating in the survey are bachelors' students or have</p> <p>Line 11 - Due to the employment status, 47.7% of the respondents are housewives- gets better- Due to the employment status, 47.7% of the respondents are the housewives.</p> <p>Line 12- are employed in (a) private organization (structures) – gets better- are employed in private organization</p> <p>Line 13 - them are employed in the state (structures). – gets better- them are employed in the state sector.</p> <p>Line 16 - 8% of the respondents are the beneficiaries of state social benefits, 32.9% of them have (a) private – remove a</p> <p>Line 19- financial condition and oral hygiene and such correlation is (a) statistically significant – remove a</p> <p>Line 21 – (the) higher. (Spearman's rho=0.372, P<0.001) - remove the</p> <p>Diagram 14.- Increased sensitivity of the teeth to (the) cold food/drinks- remove the</p> <p>Increased sensitivity of the teeth to (the) sweet food/drinks – remove the</p> <p>Increased sensitivity of the teeth to (the) hot food/drinks- remove the</p> <p>Increased sensitivity of the teeth to (the) touching – remove the</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Line 2- women in Tbilisi. 67.3% of the pregnant women have (a) bleeding gums,- remove a</p> <p>Line 4 - revealed, such as: poor socio-economic condition, low availability – gets better- revealed, such as: poor socio-economic condition, lack of availability</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Is correct	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Is correct	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and	5

supported by the content.	
Is correct	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Is correct	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):